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Introduction
Gambling Related Harm

“any initial or exacerbated adverse consequence due to an engagement with gambling that leads to a decrement to the health or wellbeing of an individual, family unit, community or population”

Langham et al (2016)
Gambling Related Harm

- Gambling related harm is a co-morbidity
- It is usually observed in people who have
  - Poor mental health
  - Stress or anxiety
  - Substance misuse
  - Financial difficulties

- Gambling related harm exacerbates pre-existing conditions

- Gambling related harm extends beyond the individual and affects the community around the individual
Impact of problem gambling

Source: IPPR adaptation of data from Australian Productivity Commission, Australia’s Gambling Industries (APC)
Gambling Related Harm: Vulnerable Locality Index

Aim:

To identify areas where individuals are more likely to be at risk from Gambling related harm based on identified at risk groups
### Person related risk factors (People at home)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factor</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Groups</td>
<td>Number of residents from certain at risk Ethnic groups*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Number of economically active unemployed residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Residents aged 10-24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor mental health</td>
<td>Patients on GP register with QOF mental health flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>Emergency homeless accommodation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This table shows the risk factors that were identified as ‘people at home’ and the indicators used to measure each risk.
Combining ‘people at home’ risk factors
### External influence (People away from home)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factor</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse/misuse</td>
<td>Drug and Alcohol treatment providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Job Centre Plus Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Education institute with students of 13-24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial difficulties</td>
<td>Payday loan shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial difficulties</td>
<td>Food Banks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This table shows the risk factors that were identified as 'people away from home' and the indicators used to measure each risk.
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Location of Gambling Establishments

Aim:

To identify areas where there is a high density of licensed gambling establishments
Location of Gambling Establishments

Density of Licensed Gambling Establishments
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Gambling Establishments: Barking and Heathway

Two hot spots for gambling establishments in Barking and Dagenham.

Barking town centre (left) and the Heathway (right).

These are also the locations of the two shopping centres in the borough and the main shopping parades.
Anti-Social Behaviour (Police Data)

Aim:

To identify areas of high level of police reported Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB)
Although Barking town centre is a hot spot for both Anti-Social Behaviour AND betting shops it is not possible to say that the two are related.

Betting shops are generally located in areas where there are shopping parades.

Barking town centre, especially around Barking station is a hot spot for various crime types, including ASB.
Index of Multiple Deprivation

Aim:

The English Indices of Deprivation 2015 are based on 37 separate indicators, organised across seven distinct domains of deprivation which are combined, using appropriate weights, to calculate the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015 (IMD 2015).
IMD 2015: Barking & Dagenham and surrounding boroughs

2015 IMD deciles
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Gambling related harm index compared to deprivation deciles
Cost to Society

Aim:

To identify the excess fiscal costs incurred by people who are problem gamblers, beyond those that are incurred by otherwise members of the public.
Calculating Excess fiscal cost

- Costs are not excess fiscal costs caused by problem gamblers. Instead, they should be taken to illustrative estimates for the excess fiscal costs incurred by people who are problem gamblers, beyond those that are incurred by otherwise members of the public.

- Prevalence of problem Gamblers based on Health Survey for England 2012:
  - Lower bound 0.2% 404 individuals
  - Upper bound 0.7% 1,414 individuals

- Costs
  - Health
  - Housing and Homelessness
  - Unemployment
  - Imprisonment
Health

General Medical Services

- Average problem gambler, excess incident of **1.5 GP visits per year** for mental health related consultation (2.4 problem gamblers – 0.9 per person in UK)
- Average length of consultation **11.7 minutes**
- Average cost per minute **£3.36** based on 2015/16 prices*

Total excess fiscal cost incurred on General Medical Services:  
*Between £30,000 and £81,000 per year* based on HSE 2012 prevalence estimates for LBBD

Hospital

Excess inpatient rate for problem gamblers  
**0.53 inpatient discharges per month**

The cost of finished consulting episodes  
**£1,842**

Total excess fiscal cost incurred on Hospital admissions:  
*Between £488,000 and £1,337,000 per year* based on HSE 2012 prevalence estimates for LBBD
Homelessness and Unemployment

Statutory Homelessness Applications

- Analysis conducted by shelter, fiscal cost associated with a period of homelessness was £2,683 per applicant, 2015/16 prices
- Excess number of annual homeless applications of \textbf{0.039 per problem gambler household}

Total excess fiscal cost incurred on homelessness:

\textit{Between £52,300 and £143,350 per year} based on HSE 2012 prevalence estimates for LBBD

Unemployment

Excess propensity to claim JSA valued at \textbf{0.06} when compared to population on the whole

Estimated unit cost of JSA claimant £2,995

Total excess fiscal cost incurred on Welfare and unemployment:

\textit{Between £89,850 and £246,200 per year} based on HSE 2012 prevalence estimates for LBBD
Incarceration

The costs associated with a 12-month prison sentence was £34,440 in 2015/16 prices. Average prison duration 8.3 months, adjusted cost £23,318 for any given prison term during a 12-month period
Excess number of annual prison sentences of 0.013 per problem gambler

Total excess fiscal cost incurred on criminal justice: *Between £151,550 and £415,300 per year* based on HSE 2012 prevalence estimates for LBBD
## Total Excess Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>GMS</td>
<td>£ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>£ 488,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£ 518,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>£ 89,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>£ 52,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>£ 151,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 811,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Revenue from Licensed Gambling Establishments

- LBBD business rates gathered from 31 betting shops in
  - £312,504

Excess fiscal cost from Gambling compared to business rates generated from licensed gambling establishments in LBBD
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